

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-15 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh (5,979,274) in view of Arnold et al. (5,233,891).

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner. Applicant also submits the following comments.

The claimed invention discloses “a one-way ratchet wrench, comprising a wrench body, a ratchet wheel, an elastic member, and a pawl member, wherein:

the wrench body has a distal end provided with a driving head formed with a mounting hole and a receiving recess, the receiving recess of the wrench body has a wall;

the ratchet wheel is rotatably mounted in the mounting hole of the wrench body;

the elastic member is mounted in the receiving recess of the wrench body;

the pawl member is pivotally mounted in the receiving recess of the wrench body and has a first side engaged with the ratchet wheel and a second side rested on the wall of the receiving recess of the wrench body; and

the pawl member has an end provided with a locking portion extended outward and fixed on a side of the elastic member so that the pawl member and the elastic member are combined together" as disclosed in the amended claim 1.

With reference to the Hsieh reference, it disclosed a ratchet wrench 1 comprising a handle having a box end 10, a ratchet wheel 11, an arch block 12 having a contact surface 121, and a spring 13. The spring 13 has one end mounted in a blind hole 102 of the box end 10, and an opposite end connected to one end of the arch block 12.

In comparison, in the Hsieh reference, one end of the arch block 12 has an arcuate edge rested on an opposite end of the spring 13 as shown in Fig. 10, so that the arch block 12 is detachably mounted on the spring 13. In such a manner, the arch block 12 and the spring 13 are not combined together.

Thus, the Hsieh reference does not teach "the pawl member has an end provided with a locking portion extended outward and fixed on a side of the elastic member so that the pawl member and the elastic member are combined together" as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

In addition, in the Hsieh reference, one end of the arch block 12 is not provided with a flat-shaped locking portion that is inserted into and locked in a partition of the spring 13.

Thus, the Hsieh reference does not teach "the elastic member is provided with a partition, and the locking portion of the pawl member is a flat plate inserted into and locked in the partition of the elastic member, so that the locking portion of

the pawl member is fixed on the elastic member” as disclosed in the amended claim 8 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Hsieh reference, one end of the arch block 12 has an arcuate wall and is not formed with an arc-shaped opening.

Thus, the Hsieh reference does not teach “the locking portion of the pawl member is formed with an arc-shaped opening facing the elastic member to retain the elastic member therein” as disclosed in the amended claim 11 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Hsieh reference, one end of the arch block 12 is not provided with a flat-shaped locking portion.

Thus, the Hsieh reference does not teach “the locking portion of the pawl member is a flat plate that has a thickness greater than a spacing distance of the elastic member” as disclosed in the amended claim 12 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Hsieh reference, the spring 13 only limits a transverse movement of the arch block 12 and cannot limit a longitudinal movement of the arch block 12.

Thus, the Hsieh reference does not teach “the locking portion of the pawl member is locked on the elastic member so that the elastic member limits longitudinal and transverse movement of the locking portion of the pawl member” as disclosed in the amended claim 15 of the claimed invention.

Therefore, from the above mentioned descriptions, it is apparent that the claimed invention has disclosed a one-way ratchet wrench whose structure and

function are quite different from and patentably distinguishable over that of the Hsieh reference. It is believed that the Hsieh reference, whether taken alone or in combination with the Arnold reference, does not provide the elements and objectives as are disclosed in the claimed invention, and cannot render obvious the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for all of the above-mentioned reasons, it is believed that the rejections of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the claims 1-15 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Applicant

Chih-Ching Hsien

58, MA YUAN WEST ST.,
TAICHUNG, TAIWAN

Sept. 22, 2004